James-Francis: Murphy, In Care of Postal Department 234277 Encinitas, California 92023-4277 Tel: 760-230-2868

In Propria Persona

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

FILED AUG 1 5 2008 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. Plaintiff. ٧.

JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY,

Defendant.

Case No. 08 CR 1196 W

APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Magistrate Judge Nina Stormes August 21, 2008 at 9:30am

James Murphy, Real Party in Interest, Third Party Intervener, Authorized Representative, Man

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

In accord with Rule 65, F.R.C.P., Third Party Intervener, hereby files this Application for an Order to Show Cause why the relief sought in the matter relating to a man, sovereign without subjects, that property including cellular telephone, laptop computer, pre- 1933 ten dollar gold coin, keys, Nuk Alert, original Apostille, and all original documents with proof of mailings should not be returned and salient issues addressed.

This Application is based upon and supported by the accompanying Memorandum of

Points and Authorities For Application For Order To Show Cause and the Affidavit

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

of James-Francis: Murphy in Support of Order to Show Cause, both of which are attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

Filed 08/15/2008

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Third Party Intervener appears and requests that this court issue an order ordering Plaintiff to;

- 1. Show cause as to why the laptop computer seized cannot be returned as the device itself has no probative value; and
- 2. Show cause as to why the cellular telephone seized cannot be returned as the device itself has no probative value; and
- 3. Show cause as to why original documents seized that validate the authenticity of documents in question should not be returned : and
- 4. explain how fundamental due process rights will not be violated since said documents are vital evidence for the defense and the Plaintiff actions have severely limited the ability to mount a defense in this action; and
- 5. Show cause as to why Third Party Intervener cannot travel as he has demonstrated by past and current conduct that he is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community; and
- 6. restrain themselves from interfering with Real Party in Interest personal property; and
- 7. explain, demonstrate and prove the compelling public interest as to why the Real Party in Interest's liberty of travel is being restricted; and

21

22

8. restrain themselves from interfering with Real Party in Interest unalienable Right to travel; and

- 9. Show cause as to what exactly about the documents are incorrect; and
- 10. Show cause as to what remedies a man, sovereign without subjects, is to do to obtain recognition in using his own travel documents; and
- 11. Show cause why it is considered a crime to execute and apply what ALL the governmental foundational agreements are about, which is self-government; and
- 12. Show cause why the internationally recognized public document called an APOSTILLE (Convention de La Haye du 5 octobre 1961) by the SECRETARY OF STATE of the State of California that CERTIFIED on May 19, 2007 the Notary Public who then certified the signature on the Act of State, Reaffirmation of Character And Renunciation of Attempted Expatriation of James-Francis: Murphy which clearly delineates his status as a Sovereign man not a United States Citizen is being ignored in violation 15 Stat. ch.249 pg 223(1868); and
- 13. Show cause as to why RPII is listed as a United States citizen when in fact such citizenship was voluntarily renounced in May 2007 with the Act of State. The United States Supreme court recognized the "right of expatriation" as an inherent right of all people and that Congress has no power under the Constitution to divest a person of his United States citizenship absent his voluntary renunciation thereof, see Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967); and
- 14. Show cause as to how Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States, "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful

23

Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;", applies to the RPII: and

Filed 08/15/2<u>0</u>08

- 15. Show cause as to how the definition of "United States" from Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedure U.S.C. Sec. 3002 Page 564 Definitions (14) "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, or any territory or possession of the United States. (15) "United States" means- (A) a Federal corporation; (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or (C) an instrumentality of the United States" applies to California, the de jure state (a republic) versus the aggregate corporation of the United States, United States of America or the STATE OF CALIFORNIA corporation; and
- 16. Show cause as to how the living man, James-Francis: Murphy, Real Party in Interest, is the territory, property or possession of the United States or UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to which Statutes, Codes, Rules and Regulations apply; and
- 17. Show cause why this instant case is occurring in the United States District Court which, according to Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 312(1922), "The United States District Court is not a true United States Court established under Article III of the Constitution to administer the judicial power of the United States therein conveyed. It is created by virtue of the sovereign congressional faculty, granted under Article IV, Sec. 3, of that instrument, of making all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States." and The

20

21

22

23

United States District Court is "a mere territorial court" and COCHRAN et. al. v.
ST. PAUL & TACHOMA LUMBER CO. 73 Fed. Supp 288 (1947), which states,
'A United States District Court is purely a creature of legislative branch of
government, generally provided for by Constitution, but not a constitutional court
n stricter sense, and its jurisdiction comes from Congress."; and
Show cause as to how Senate Ethic Committee Rule 54 applies to the RPII who

- 18. 0 functions from the county as declared in his Act of State which is foreign to the United States and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; and
- 19. Show cause as to how the RPII is suable when in ALDINGER v. HOWARD, TREASURER OF SPOKANE COUNTY, ET AL 427 U.S. 1(1976) "the county is not suable as a "person" Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. 1983 for purposes of asserting a state-law claim not within federal jurisdiction, is without the District Court's statutory jurisdiction. The counties are excluded from the "person[s]" answerable to the [427 U.S. 1, 2] plaintiff "in an action at law [or] suit in equity" to redress the enumerated deprivations; and
- 20. Show cause as to why RPII is not competent authority as a Sovereign State-infact to create and issue its own house a "passport" in the nature of said definition or to obtain one from a neutral source according to the Immigration and Naturalization Act of June 27, A.D. 1952, 66 Statutes at Large Public Law 414 wherein in that Act, it states in Title I, Section 101, Definitions, page 170 "(30) The term 'passport' means any travel document issued by competent authority showing the bearer's origin, identity, and nationality if any, which is valid for the entry of the bearer into a foreign country."; and

21

22

21. Show cause as to why the Grand Jury (GJ) transcript (copy) relevant to the defendant's guilt or innocence of the alleged crimes should not be turned over; and

- 22. Show cause how not turning over the GJ transcript relevant to the defendant's guilt or innocence of the alleged crimes would not deprive the defendant of the constitutional right of effective assistance of counsel and the right to be prepared for cross-examination of accusing witnesses; and
- 23. Show cause why plaintiff should not admit that named defendant, JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY, does not exist as a Limited Liability Company, Limited Liability Partnership, Limited Partnership, General Partnership, alpha scroll, Sole Partnership, Unincorporated Business Organization, or Corporation filed with STATE OF CALIFORNIA: and
- 24. Show cause why plaintiff should not admit that in relation to entity known as JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY, named defendant, that United States Attorney General in his capacity as alien property custodian pursuant to 50 USC Appx 12 among other statutes and codes is not the former trustee of said entity JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY; and
- 25. Show cause why Assistant United States Attorney Fred Sheppard should not admit that he is an agent of a foreign principle due to his relationship as member of CA State Bar #250781 since October 2007 therein being subsidiary of international bar domiciled in United Kingdom under Bank of England in accordance with 22 USC 611 and Bar Treaty of 1947; and

	Case 3:08-cr-0119
1 2	26. Show Cause why in open court in the

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26	S. Show Cause why the plaintiff,	UNITED	STATES	OF A	MERICA,	should i	not te	estify
	in open court in this matter as	to injurie:	s sustaine	ed; and	d			

27. Show Cause as to what relief requested should not be issued as prayed for in Third Party Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause.

IT IS FURTHER HEREBY ORDERED, that pending the hearing and determination of the Order to Show Cause, said Plaintiff, and all persons acting in concert or participation with them, be and they hereby are to be restrained regarding further action of Plaintiff in relation to Real Party in Interest.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that service of this Order to Show Cause together with a copy of the papers filed with the Application therefore by hand delivery to the Assistant U. S. Attorney Fred Sheppard, 880 Front Street Room 6293, San Diego, California, on or before, 2008, at \_\_o'clock \_\_\_.m. be deemed sufficient service. Plaintiff's opposition, if any, shall be filed and served by personal delivery on or before \_ .m. on \_\_\_\_\_ August, 2008, and the petitioner's reply, if any, shall be filed and served by personal delivery on or before \_\_\_\_\_.m. on \_\_\_\_\_\_, 2008.

The Court having read and considered Third Party Intervener's Application for Order to Show Cause and being fully advised in the premises and good cause appearing therefore;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Plaintiff appear before this Court on the date listed above, then and there to show cause, if any there be, why Plaintiff should not

1. Show cause as to why the laptop computer seized cannot be returned as the device itself has no probative value; and

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2. Show cause as to why the cellular telephone seized cannot be returned as the device itself has no probative value; and

- 3. Show cause as to why original documents seized that validate the authenticity of documents in question should not be returned : and
- 4. explain how fundamental due process rights will not be violated since said documents are vital evidence for the defense and the Plaintiff actions have severely limited the ability to mount a defense in this action; and
- Show cause as to why Third Party Intervener cannot travel as he has demonstrated by past and current conduct that he is neither a flight risk nor a danger to the community; and
- restrain themselves from interfering with Real Party in Interest personal property; and
- 7. explain, demonstrate and prove the compelling public interest as to why the Real Party in Interest's liberty of travel is being restricted; and
- 8. restrain themselves from interfering with Real Party in Interest unalienable Right to travel; and
- 9. Show cause as to what exactly about the documents are incorrect; and
- 10. Show cause as to what remedies a man, sovereign without subjects, is to do to obtain recognition in using his own travel documents; and
- 11. Show cause why it is considered a crime to execute and apply what ALL the governmental foundational agreements are about, which is self-government; and

Filed 08/15/2008

20

21

23

- 12. Show cause why the internationally recognized public document called an APOSTILLE (Convention de La Haye du 5 octobre 1961) by the SECRETARY OF STATE of the State of California that CERTIFIED on May 19, 2007 the Notary Public who then certified the signature on the Act of State, Reaffirmation of Character And Renunciation of Attempted Expatriation of James-Francis: Murphy which clearly delineates his status as a Sovereign man not a United States Citizen is being ignored in violation 15 Stat. ch.249 **pg 223(1868**); and
- 13. Show cause as to why RPII is listed as a United States citizen when in fact such citizenship was voluntarily renounced in May 2007 with the Act of State. The United States Supreme court recognized the "right of expatriation" as an inherent right of all people and that Congress has no power under the Constitution to divest a person of his United States citizenship absent his voluntary renunciation thereof, see Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253 (1967); and
- 14. Show cause as to how Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution of the United States, "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;", applies to the RPII: and
- 15. Show cause as to how the definition of "United States" from Title 28 Judiciary and Judicial Procedure U.S.C. Sec. 3002 Page 564 Definitions (14) "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas,

or any territory or possession of the United States. (15)"United States" means- (A) a Federal corporation; (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or (C) an instrumentality of the United States" applies to California, the de jure state (a republic) versus the aggregate corporation of the United States, United States of America or the STATE OF CALIFORNIA corporation; and

- 16. Show cause as to how the living man, James-Francis: Murphy, Real Party in Interest, is the territory, property or possession of the United States or UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to which Statutes, Codes, Rules and Regulations apply; and
- 17. Show cause why this instant case is occurring in the United States District
  Court which, according to Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 312(1922), "The
  United States District Court is not a true United States Court established
  under Article III of the Constitution to administer the judicial power of the
  United States therein conveyed. It is created by virtue of the sovereign
  congressional faculty, granted under Article IV, Sec. 3, of that instrument, of
  making all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to
  the United States." and The United States District Court is "a mere territorial
  court" and COCHRAN et. al. v. ST. PAUL & TACHOMA LUMBER CO. 73
  Fed. Supp 288 (1947), which states, "A United States District Court is purely
  a creature of legislative branch of government, generally provided for by
  Constitution, but not a constitutional court in stricter sense, and its jurisdiction
  comes from Congress."; and

21

22

18	3. Show cause as to how Senate Ethic Committee Rule 54 applies to the RPII
	who functions from the county as declared in his Act of State which is foreign
	to the United States and UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: and

- 19. Show cause as to how the RPII is suable when in ALDINGER v. HOWARD, TREASURER OF SPOKANE COUNTY, ET AL 427 U.S. 1(1976) "the county is not suable as a "person" Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. 1983 for purposes of asserting a state-law claim not within federal jurisdiction, is without the District Court's statutory jurisdiction. The counties are excluded from the "person[s]" answerable to the [427 U.S. 1, 2] plaintiff "in an action at law [or] suit in equity" to redress the enumerated deprivations; and
- 20. Show cause as to why RPII is not competent authority as a Sovereign State-in-fact to create and issue its own house a "passport" in the nature of said definition or to obtain one from a neutral source according to the Immigration and Naturalization Act of June 27, A.D. 1952, 66 Statutes at Large Public Law 414 wherein in that Act, it states in Title I, Section 101, Definitions, page 170 "(30) The term 'passport' means any travel document issued by competent authority showing the bearer's origin, identity, and nationality if any, which is valid for the entry of the bearer into a foreign country."; and
- 21. Show cause as to why the Grand Jury (GJ) transcript (copy) relevant to the defendant's guilt or innocence of the alleged crimes should not be turned over; and

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

22	2. Show cause how not turning over the GJ transcript relevant to the defendant's
	guilt or innocence of the alleged crimes would not deprive the defendant of
	the constitutional right of effective assistance of counsel and the right to be
	prepared for cross-examination of accusing witnesses; and

- 23. Show cause why plaintiff should not admit that named defendant, JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY, does not exist as a Limited Liability Company, Limited Liability Partnership, Limited Partnership, General Partnership, alpha scroll, Sole Partnership, Unincorporated Business Organization, or Corporation filed with STATE OF CALIFORNIA: and
- 24. Show cause why plaintiff should not admit that in relation to entity known as JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY, named defendant, that United States Attorney General in his capacity as alien property custodian pursuant to 50 USC Appx 12 among other statutes and codes is not the former trustee of said entity JAMES FRANCIS MURPHY; and
- 25. Show cause why Assistant United States Attorney Fred Sheppard should not admit that he is an agent of a foreign principle due to his relationship as member of CA State Bar #250781 since October 2007 therein being subsidiary of international bar domiciled in United Kingdom under Bank of England in accordance with 22 USC 611 and Bar Treaty of 1947; and
- 26. Show Cause why the plaintiff, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, should not testify in open court in this matter as to injuries sustained; and
- 27. Show Cause as to what relief requested should not be issued as prayed for in Third Party Plaintiff's Application for Order to Show Cause...

8

13

James-Francis: Murphy,
In Care of Postal Department 234277
Encinitas, California 92023-4277

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15<sup>th</sup> August, 2008.

Tel: 760-230-2868 In Propria Persona

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2

3 4

5

6

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17 18 COPY of the forgoing hand delivered, This 15<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2008, to: U. S. Assistant Attorney Fred Sheppard 880 Front Street Room 6293

San Diego, CA 619-557-5610

Service performed by:

James-Francis: Murphy

In Care of Postal Department 234277 Encinitas, California 92023-4277

Tel: 760-230-2868